



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

MU

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/817,045	04/02/2004	Dethe Elza	413478004US	2219
25096	7590	10/19/2006	EXAMINER	
PERKINS COIE LLP			BOTTS, MICHAEL K	
PATENT-SEA				
P.O. BOX 1247			ART UNIT	
SEATTLE, WA 98111-1247			PAPER NUMBER	
			2176	

DATE MAILED: 10/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/817,045	ELZA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael K. Botts	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 July 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-67 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-67 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 July 2006 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>July 20, 2006</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This document is a Final Office Action on the merits. This action is responsive to the following communications: Amendment in Response to Non-Final Office Action, which was filed on July 20, 2006.
2. Claims 1-67 are currently pending in the case, with claims 1 and 32 being the independent claims.
3. The drawings were objected to. Applicants have made submitted replacement drawings for figures 2, 9, 14, and 16. The Amendments noted in the Amendments to the Drawings section of Applicants Amendment in Response to Non-Final Office Action, page 5, are accepted and, accordingly, those objections are withdrawn. Other objections to the drawings, as noted below, are maintained.
4. The specification was objected to. Applicants made some appropriate amendments to the specification in response to the objections, accordingly, those amendments are withdrawn. Other objections to the specification, as noted below, are maintained.
5. Applicants amended the claims, but failed to appropriately identify those amendments. In the interest of compact examination, the Examiner has determined the amendments from the Remarks section of Applicants' response. Applicant is reminded of the proper method of amending claims and warned that further nonresponsive responses may not be accepted. See, 37 CFR 1.121, and MPEP 714.
6. Claims 1-67 are rejected.

Information Disclosure Statement

7. A signed and dated copy of applicant's IDS, which was filed on July 20, 2006, is attached to this Office Action.

Drawings

8. The drawings are objected to because of the specific reasons cited below. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

9. The drawings are objected to because of the following reasons:

Regarding all Figures, generally: Lead lines are generally missing. Lead lines are required for each reference character except for those that indicate the surface or cross section on which they are placed. See MPEP 608.02(q). Applicants are required to review all figures and make appropriate corrections in order to comply with 37 CFR 1.121(d) and MPEP 608.02(q).

Regarding Figures 3, 7B, 7C, 7D, 15, 16, 17, and 18: Reference numbers to the items therein are necessary to understand the figures. See, 35 U.S.C. 113.

Regarding Figure 1: Items 106, 108, and 112 contain labels within shaded regions. Numbers, letters, and reference characters should not be placed upon shaded surfaces. See, MPEP 608.02(p)(3).

Regarding Figure 3: Two items are labeled "302." The same reference character must never be used to designate different parts. See, MPEP 608.02(p)(5). It is suggested that if the parts are similar, applicants may identify the parts as "302A" and "302B," or adopt a similar distinctive identification scheme.

Regarding Figures 3 and 4: Parts of Figure 4 appear to be an expanded view of part of Figure 3, but the relationship between the Figures is not clear. It is assumed that Applicants intended to further illustrate the relationships between items on Figure 3 in

Art Unit: 2176

Figure 4, and based on that assumption, Applicants are directed to clearly show that relationship. See, MPEP 608.02(h) for guidance in showing exploded and partial views.

Further regarding Figures 3 and 4: It appears that items in Figure 3 also appear in Figure 4, but under different identification numbers. The same part of an invention appearing in more than one view of the drawing must always be designated by the same reference character. See, MPEP 608.02(p)(4). For example, the same items with multiple reference numbers include: 302 as 401; 304 as 407; 306 as 413; 310 as 410; and, many other multiple numbers. Applicants are required to review all Figures and make appropriate correction such that the identification numbers are uniform and consistent.

Regarding Figure 4: Items 418, 420, and 422 are not related to the rest of the figure. The disclosure identifies relationships for the items, but such relationships are not identified in the drawings. Specifically, item 418 is disclosed to relate to DDOM Client 407 through the DDOM protocol adapter and Message layer 412, but no such relationship is shown in the drawing. See, Specification, paragraph [0080]. Similarly, relationships are disclosed in paragraphs [0085] for items 420 and 422, but such relationships are not shown in the drawing. Appropriate correction is required.

Regarding Figure 7A: This Figure appears to be an exploded view of the "Server: MutateTree Routine" identified in Figure 10A, item 1014. Appropriate correction is

Art Unit: 2176

required to properly identify the relationship of Figure 7A to Figure 10A and to make the reference numbers uniform and consistent. See, MPEP 608.02(h) and 608.02(p)(4).

Regarding Figure 8: This appears to be a full or partial exploded view of the "Broadcast" as disclosed in Figure 4, item 422. The relationship, if any, of this Figure must be clarified in relation to any other figures or items. See, MPEP 609.02(h).

Regarding Figure 9: The decision flow appears to be in error. Specifically, decision elements leading from items 904 and 906 do not make sense logically. In addition, it is unclear but appears from comparing Figure 9 to the disclosure, [00123], that the flow arrow from 908 to 916 should be to 908 instead. It also appears that the start should lead to block 906. Appropriate correction to accurately reflect the decision flow is required.

Regarding Figure 10A: It appears that items 1014 and 1016 are condensations of full or partial views disclosed in Figures 7A and 10B respectively. See, MPEP 608.02(h). Appropriate correction to accurately reflect the relationship between the views is required.

Regarding Figure 10B: As discussed above, it appears that Figure 10B is a full or partial exploded view of Figure 10A, item 1016. Appropriate correction to accurately reflect the relationship between the views is required.

Regarding Figure 14: Item 1413 does not appear in the disclosure. Reference characters not mentioned in the description shall not appear in the drawings. See, MPEP 608.02(p)(5). Appropriate correction is required.

Regarding Figures 16, 17, and 18: These drawings appear to present a flow of data or information, but it is unclear what is being shown and to where the various flow lines lead. See, 35 U.S.C. 113. As is noted above, reference numbers should assist in making the figures more clear. It is also suggested that Applicants consider using alternative flow chart diagrams to show/illustrate the invention.

Regarding Figures 1, 5, 6, 9, and 11: Figures 1, 5, 6, 9, and 11 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g).

Corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

10. In that there were so many corrections and clarifications noted in the drawings, Applicants are directed to review all drawings to ensure that they meet the law and rules for such drawings. In making their corrections, Applicants are cautioned against introducing any new matter into any new Figures.

The Specification

11. Applicant is required to update the status (pending, allowed, etc.) of all parent priority applications in the first line of the specification. The status of all citations of U.S. filed applications in the specification should also be updated where appropriate.

12. Many elements are discussed in the disclosure without citation to reference numbers, where those same elements are identified in the drawings by reference number. See, e.g., paragraphs [0076]-[0096]. For clarity of understanding, it is suggested that the drawing elements referred to in the disclosure should be followed by the appropriate reference number. See, MPEP 2163.02. Appropriate correction is suggested.

13. Paragraphs [00123]-[00125] and Figure 9 appear to disclose a decision tree for a "Mutation" routine. The logic in the decision tree appears to be in error. The confusion may be due at least in part from the omission of some of the choices from the decision

Art Unit: 2176

tree: specifically items 904 and 906. Applicant should examine the cited paragraphs and Figure to ensure that they are accurate. Appropriate correction is required.

14. The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Claims Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

15. **Claims 1-2, 6-8, 14, 17, 30-31, 56, and 65-67** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Iverson, Lee, "NODAL: A Filesystem for Ubiquitous Collaboration," White Paper, SRI International, September 20, 2001 [hereinafter "NODAL"].

Regarding **independent claim 1, as amended**, NODAL teaches:

A system for sharing a hierarchical document, the hierarchical document having a node, comprising:

Art Unit: 2176

(See, NODAL, pages 1-32, teaching sharing a hierarchical document and the hierarchical document having nodes.)

a component that receives an indication of a privilege for the node, the privilege indicating access rights for the node and determined based on another node of the hierarchical document, the indication including a holder of the privilege;

(See, NODAL, pages 17-18, teaching the “user” identity object, which contains content access. See also, NODAL, page 17, last full paragraph, teaching that the access rights are determined based on another node, specifically a password.)

a component that receives an access request to the node from a requestor; and

(See, NODAL, pages 18-21, teaching the “cursor” object, which is the portal for accessing mutation interfaces and evaluate permissions.)

a component that handles the received access request, wherein the handling includes determining whether the requestor is a holder of a privilege that is appropriate for the received access request.

(See, NODAL, pages 18-21, teaching the “cursor” object, which is the portal for accessing mutation interfaces and evaluate permissions. See also, NODAL, pages 17-18, teaching that the permissions are contained in the “user” object, which identifies the user, among other functions.)

Art Unit: 2176

Regarding **dependent claim 2**, NODAL teaches:

The system of claim 1 wherein the holder of the privilege is a user.

(See, NODAL, pages 17-18, teaching the “user” identity object.)

Regarding **dependent claim 6**, NODAL teaches:

The system of claim 1 wherein the system receives an indication of the holder from an operating system.

(See, NODAL, page 20, teaching the “pedigree” and the identification of the user.)

Regarding **dependent claim 7**, NODAL teaches:

The system of claim 1 wherein the system authenticates the holder.

(See, NODAL, pages 17-27, teaching security of access.)

Regarding **dependent claim 8**, NODAL teaches:

The system of claim 1 wherein the received access request is a mutation relating to a node.

(See, NODAL, pages 17-27, teaching security of access and requests for mutation of the document.)

Regarding **dependent claim 14**, NODAL teaches:

The system of claim 1 wherein the holder holds multiple privileges.

(See, NODAL, page 18, teaching that the “user” object may hold multiple privileges.)

Regarding **dependent claim 17**, NODAL teaches:

The system of claim 1 wherein the holder holds a different privilege on attributes of the node.

(See, NODAL, page 18, teaching that the capabilities to be modified are controlled by the node and that a user may have a variety of capabilities or privileges in the “user identity” object.)

Regarding **dependent claim 30**, NODAL teaches:

The system of claim 1 wherein the handling includes returning a message comprising an indication of mutations to users of the system.

(See, NODAL, page 27, teaching acknowledgement messaging from the server to the client. Note that the server may send any message to the client at any time.)

Regarding **dependent claim 31**, NODAL teaches:

The system of claim 30 wherein the message includes only information for which a recipient of the message holds an appropriate privilege.

(See, NODAL, page 27, teaching acknowledgement messaging from the server to the client, who inherently holds the privilege for that indicated mutation.)

Regarding **dependent claim 56**, NODAL teaches:

The method of claim 54 wherein the mutation is to remove an attribute.

(See, NODAL, pages 20-21, teaching attributes including last modification time, etc. and modifications to the “timestamp” from mutations of the document.)

Regarding **dependent claim 65**, NODAL teaches:

The method of claim 32 wherein the access request identifies the node with a unique identification.

(See, NODAL, page 11, teaching unique node identifiers.)

Regarding **dependent claim 66**, NODAL teaches:

The method of claim 32 wherein the access request is received as a message.

(See, NODAL, page 27, teaching messaging.)

Regarding **dependent claim 67**, NODAL teaches:

The method of claim 66 wherein the message is represented in XML.

(See, NODAL, pages 28-29, teaching that the system may be enabled in XML.)

Art Unit: 2176

Regarding **claims 32, 33, 37, 38, 39, 46, 49, 63, and 64**, claims 32, 33, 37, 38, 39, 46, 49, 63, and 64 incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 14, 17, 30, and 31, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

16. It is noted that any citations to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art.

See, MPEP 2123.

Claims Rejection – 35 U.S.C. 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

17. **Claims 3-5, 9-13, 15-16, and 18-29** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Iverson, Lee, "NODAL: A Filesystem for Ubiquitous Collaboration," White Paper, SRI International, September 20, 2001 [hereinafter "NODAL"], as applied to claims 1 and/or 2 above and further in view of Bray, et al. (U.S. Patent 6,529,905 B1, filed January 11, 2000, and issued May 4, 2003) [hereinafter "Bray"].

Regarding **dependent claim 3**, NODAL in view of Bray teaches:

The system of claim 2 wherein the holder is an application program.

(NODAL teaches the limitations of claims 1 and 2 above, but does not expressly teach that the holder of privileges may be an application program.

Bray expressly teaches that "A user may be a computer process or an actual person working at a workstation." Bray, col. 1, lines 53-55.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of NODAL with those of Bray to result in a multi-user hierarchical versioning system wherein a user may be a computer application.

Both NODAL and Bray involve the same field of endeavor, multi-user hierarchical document versioning systems.

The suggestion or motivation to combine the two references is drawn from the express statement in Bray that the system may be operated by a user or a computer process.)

Regarding **dependent claim 4**, NODAL in view of Bray teaches:

The system of claim 2 wherein the holder is an operator of an application program.

(NODAL teaches the limitations of claims 1 and 2 above, but does not expressly teach that the holder of privileges may be the operator of an application program.

Bray expressly teaches that "A user may be a computer process or an actual person working at a workstation." Bray, col. 1, lines 53-55. This inherently includes an operator of the program or computer process.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of NODAL with those of Bray to result in a multi-user hierarchical versioning system wherein a user may be a computer application.

Both NODAL and Bray involve the same field of endeavor, multi-user hierarchical document versioning systems.

The suggestion or motivation to combine the two references is drawn from the express statement in Bray that the system may be operated by a user or a computer process. A "person at a workstation" is inherently a user of an application, and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to grant the privileges to the person using the privileges. This suggestion to make the actual user the holder of the privileges is also suggested by NODAL which manages privileges from the "user" object. See, NODAL, pages 17-18.)

Regarding **dependent claim 5**, NODAL in view of Bray teaches:

The system of claim 1 wherein the holder is a client computing device.

(NODAL teaches the limitations of claim 1 above, but does not expressly teach that the holder of privileges is a client computing device.

Bray expressly teaches that "A user may be a computer process or an actual person working at a workstation." Bray, col. 1, lines 53-55.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of NODAL with those of Bray to result in a multi-user hierarchical versioning system wherein a user may be a computer application. It would have also been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that the computer on which the application resides may be designated as the user. It was well known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to identify a client terminal with certain access privileges, e.g. public terminals made available in libraries and public offices which may access internal documents in those institutions.

Both NODAL and Bray involve the same field of endeavor, multi-user hierarchical document versioning systems. Both NODAL and Bray teach systems compatible with either a client/server or peer-to-peer environment.

The suggestion or motivation to combine the two references is drawn from the express statement in Bray that the system may be operated by a user or a computer process.)

Regarding **dependent claim 9**, NODAL in view of Bray teaches:

The system of claim 8 wherein the indication of an access request indicates the node.

Art Unit: 2176

(NODAL teaches the limitations of claims 1 and 8, above, but it does not expressly teach the limitation wherein an access request indicates the node.

Bray expressly teaches that an access request indicates the node and further that an appropriate edit lock is placed on the node. See, Bray, col. 2, line 63 through col. 3, line 31.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of NODAL with those of Bray.

The suggestion or motivation to combine the references is drawn from the fact that NODAL teaches a multi-user hierarchical document editing system from a less specific viewpoint, while Bray teaches the same system with emphasis on the locking editing and locking functions. The references teach the same art with varying degrees of detail for specific functions.)

Regarding **dependent claim 10**, NODAL in view of Bray teaches:

The system of claim 8 wherein the privilege is appropriate for the received access request when the mutation and privilege are both Insert.

(NODAL teaches the elements of claims 1 and 8, above, but it does not expressly teach the limitation wherein an access request indicates the node.

Bray expressly teaches that an access request indicates the node and further that an appropriate edit lock is placed on the node. See, Bray, col. 5, lines 45-48, teaching that when a lock request is received identifying a target element and lock type,

Art Unit: 2176

the first step is to check for appropriate permissions to set the lock, inherently including permission to make the requested type of edit.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of NODAL with those of Bray.

The suggestion or motivation to combine the references is drawn from the fact that NODAL teaches a multi-user hierarchical document editing system from a less specific viewpoint, while Bray teaches the same system with emphasis on the locking editing and locking functions. The references teach the same art with varying degrees of detail for specific functions.)

Regarding **dependent claim 11**, NODAL in view of Bray teaches:

The system of claim 8 wherein the privilege is appropriate for the received access request when the mutation and privilege are both Update.

(NODAL teaches the elements of claims 1 and 8, above, but it does not expressly teach the limitation wherein an access request indicates the node.

Bray expressly teaches that an access request indicates the node and further that an appropriate edit lock is placed on the node. See, Bray, col. 5, lines 45-48, teaching that when a lock request is received identifying a target element and lock type, the first step is to check for appropriate permissions to set the lock, inherently including permission to make the requested type of edit.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of NODAL with those of Bray.

The suggestion or motivation to combine the references is drawn from the fact that NODAL teaches a multi-user hierarchical document editing system from a less specific viewpoint, while Bray teaches the same system with emphasis on the locking editing and locking functions. The references teach the same art with varying degrees of detail for specific functions.)

Regarding **dependent claim 12**, NODAL in view of Bray teaches:

The system of claim 8 wherein the privilege is appropriate for the received access request when the mutation and privilege are both Delete.

(NODAL teaches the elements of claims 1 and 8, above, but it does not expressly teach the limitation wherein an access request indicates the node.

Bray expressly teaches that an access request indicates the node and further that an appropriate edit lock is placed on the node. See, Bray, col. 5, lines 45-48, teaching that when a lock request is received identifying a target element and lock type, the first step is to check for appropriate permissions to set the lock, inherently including permission to make the requested type of edit.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of NODAL with those of Bray.

The suggestion or motivation to combine the references is drawn from the fact that NODAL teaches a multi-user hierarchical document editing system from a less specific viewpoint, while Bray teaches the same system with emphasis on the locking

Art Unit: 2176

editing and locking functions. The references teach the same art with varying degrees of detail for specific functions.)

Regarding **dependent claim 13**, NODAL in view of Bray teaches:

The system of claim 1 wherein the privilege is appropriate for the received access request when the received access request is Read and the privilege is Insert.

(NODAL teaches the elements of claims 1, above, but it does not expressly teach the limitations of Read and Insert.

Bray expressly teaches that an access request indicates the node and further that an appropriate edit lock is placed on the node. See, Bray, col. 5, lines 45-48, teaching that when a lock request is received identifying a target element and lock type, the first step is to check for appropriate permissions to set the lock, inherently including permission to make the requested type of edit.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of NODAL with those of Bray.

The suggestion or motivation to combine the references is drawn from the fact that NODAL teaches a multi-user hierarchical document editing system from a less specific viewpoint, while Bray teaches the same system with emphasis on the locking editing and locking functions. The references teach the same art with varying degrees of detail for specific functions.)

Art Unit: 2176

Regarding **dependent claim 15**, NODAL in view of Bray teaches:

The system of claim 1 wherein the holder holds the privilege on descendants of the node merely by holding a privilege on the node.

(NODAL teaches the elements of claim 1, above, but it does not expressly teach the limitations of holding privilege on descendants of the node merely by holding a privilege on the node.

Bray expressly teaches that an access request indicates the node and further that an edit lock is placed on the children of the node. See, Bray, col. 6, lines 65 through col. 7, line 6.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of NODAL with those of Bray.

The suggestion or motivation to combine the references is drawn from the fact that NODAL teaches a multi-user hierarchical document editing system from a less specific viewpoint, while Bray teaches the same system with emphasis on the locking editing and locking functions. The references teach the same art with varying degrees of detail for specific functions.)

Regarding **dependent claim 16**, NODAL in view of Bray teaches:

The system of claim 15 wherein the privilege is Delete.

(Nodal teaches the limitations of claims 1 and 15, above, but it does not expressly teach the limitation wherein the privilege is Delete.

Bray expressly teaches the Delete privilege. See, Bray, col. 8, line 63 through col. 9, line 64.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of NODAL with those of Bray.

The suggestion or motivation to combine the references is drawn from the fact that NODAL teaches a multi-user hierarchical document editing system from a less specific viewpoint, while Bray teaches the same system with emphasis on the locking editing and locking functions. The references teach the same art with varying degrees of detail for specific functions.)

Regarding **dependent claim 18**, NODAL in view of Bray teaches:

The system of claim 17 wherein the privilege is Insert and the different privilege is Read.

(Nodal teaches the limitations of claims 1 and 17, above, but it does not expressly teach the limitation wherein the privileges are Insert and Read. See, NODAL, page 18, teaching that the capabilities to be modified are controlled by the node and that a user may have a variety of capabilities or privileges in the "user identity" object. See, also, NODAL, pages 18-20, teaching inserting a node.

Bray expressly teaches the viewing, or read, function. See, Bray, col. 6, lines 43-49.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of NODAL with those of Bray.

The suggestion or motivation to combine the references is drawn from the fact that NODAL teaches a multi-user hierarchical document editing system from a less specific viewpoint, while Bray teaches the same system with emphasis on the locking editing and locking functions. The references teach the same art with varying degrees of detail for specific functions.)

Regarding **dependent claim 19**, NODAL in view of Bray teaches:

The system of claim 17 wherein the holder does not hold the privilege on descendants of the node merely by holding the privilege on the node.

(Nodal teaches the limitations of claims 1 and 17, above, but it does not expressly teach the limitation wherein the holder does not hold the privilege on descendants of the node merely by holding the privilege on the node.

Bray expressly teaches that if the authoring environment does not track versioning that the parents and children are not locked during an edit request. See, Bray, col. 7, lines 59-67.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of NODAL with those of Bray.

The suggestion or motivation to combine the references is drawn from the fact that NODAL teaches a multi-user hierarchical document editing system from a less specific viewpoint, while Bray teaches the same system with emphasis on the locking editing and locking functions. The references teach the same art with varying degrees of detail for specific functions.)

Regarding **dependent claim 20**, NODAL in view of Bray teaches:

The system of claim 1 wherein the holder does not hold a privilege on a descendant of the node merely by owning the privilege on the node.

(Nodal teaches the limitations of claim 1, above, but it does not expressly teach the limitation wherein the holder does not own the privilege on descendants of the node merely by holding the privilege on the node.

Bray expressly teaches that if the authoring environment does not track versioning that the parents and children are not locked during an edit request. See, Bray, col. 7, lines 59-67.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of NODAL with those of Bray.

The suggestion or motivation to combine the references is drawn from the fact that NODAL teaches a multi-user hierarchical document editing system from a less specific viewpoint, while Bray teaches the same system with emphasis on the locking editing and locking functions. The references teach the same art with varying degrees of detail for specific functions.)

Regarding **dependent claim 21**, NODAL in view of Bray teaches:

The system of claim 1 wherein the holder holds a different privilege on a parent of the node.

Art Unit: 2176

(Nodal teaches the limitations of claim 1, above, but it does not expressly teach the limitation wherein the holder a different privilege on a parent of the node.

Bray expressly teaches a create lock on the target's parent and an edit lock on a target's children in an edit function. See, Bray, col. 7, lines 53-58.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of NODAL with those of Bray.

The suggestion or motivation to combine the references is drawn from the fact that NODAL teaches a multi-user hierarchical document editing system from a less specific viewpoint, while Bray teaches the same system with emphasis on the locking editing and locking functions. The references teach the same art with varying degrees of detail for specific functions.)

Regarding **dependent claim 22**, NODAL in view of Bray teaches:

The system of claim 21 wherein the holder is privileged to request a mutation relating to the parent.

(Nodal teaches the limitations of claim 1, above, but it does not expressly teach the limitations of claim 21 or the limitation wherein the holder is privileged to request a mutation relating to the parent node.

Bray expressly teaches a create lock on the target's parent and an edit lock on a target's children in an edit function. See, Bray, col. 7, lines 53-58. Because the lock on the parent is a "create" lock, it is inherent that the holder is privileged to request a mutation of the parent.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of NODAL with those of Bray.

The suggestion or motivation to combine the references is drawn from the fact that NODAL teaches a multi-user hierarchical document editing system from a less specific viewpoint, while Bray teaches the same system with emphasis on the locking editing and locking functions. The references teach the same art with varying degrees of detail for specific functions.)

Regarding **dependent claim 23**, NODAL in view of Bray teaches:

The system of claim 22 wherein the mutation is to remove the node.

(Nodal teaches the limitations of claim 1, above, above, but it does not expressly teach the limitation of claims 21 or 22 or the limitation wherein the mutation is to remove the node.

Bray expressly teaches a create lock on the target's parent and an edit lock on a target's children in an edit function. See, Bray, col. 7, lines 53-58. Because the lock on the parent is a "create" lock, it is inherent that the holder is privileged to request a mutation of the parent, including a delete request.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of NODAL with those of Bray.

The suggestion or motivation to combine the references is drawn from the fact that NODAL teaches a multi-user hierarchical document editing system from a less specific viewpoint, while Bray teaches the same system with emphasis on the locking editing

Art Unit: 2176

and locking functions. The references teach the same art with varying degrees of detail for specific functions.)

Regarding **dependent claim 24**, NODAL in view of Bray teaches:

The system of claim 1 wherein multiple holders hold the privilege.

(Nodal teaches the limitations of claim 1 above, but it does not expressly teach the limitation wherein multiple holders hold the privilege.

Bray expressly teaches that multiple users may hold an edit privilege. See, Bray, claim 1, stating that multiple users may hold a privilege to edit a node.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of NODAL with those of Bray.

The suggestion or motivation to combine the references is drawn from the fact that NODAL teaches a multi-user hierarchical document editing system from a less specific viewpoint, while Bray teaches the same system with emphasis on the locking editing and locking functions. The references teach the same art with varying degrees of detail for specific functions.)

Regarding **dependent claim 25**, NODAL in view of Bray teaches:

The system of claim 1 wherein the holder of the privilege is a privilege group.

(Nodal teaches the limitations of claim 1, above, but it does not expressly teach the limitation wherein the holder of the privilege is a privilege group.

Bray expressly teaches that multiple users may hold an edit privilege. See, Bray, claim 1, stating that multiple users may hold a privilege to edit a node. It is inherent that a group with the same privilege may be considered a privilege group.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of NODAL with those of Bray.

The suggestion or motivation to combine the references is drawn from the fact that NODAL teaches a multi-user hierarchical document editing system from a less specific viewpoint, while Bray teaches the same system with emphasis on the locking editing and locking functions. The references teach the same art with varying degrees of detail for specific functions.)

Regarding **dependent claim 26**, NODAL in view of Bray teaches:

The system of claim 25 wherein the privilege group has multiple members.

(Nodal teaches the limitations of claim 1, above, but it does not expressly teach the limitation of claim 25 or the limitation wherein the privilege group has multiple members.

Bray expressly teaches that multiple users may hold an edit privilege. See, Bray, claim 1, stating that multiple users may hold a privilege to edit a node. It is inherent that a privilege group comprised of multiple members with the same privilege contain multiple members.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of NODAL with those of Bray.

The suggestion or motivation to combine the references is drawn from the fact that NODAL teaches a multi-user hierarchical document editing system from a less specific viewpoint, while Bray teaches the same system with emphasis on the locking editing and locking functions. The references teach the same art with varying degrees of detail for specific functions.)

Regarding **dependent claim 27**, NODAL in view of Bray teaches:

The system of claim 26 wherein the member is an application program.

(Nodal teaches the limitations of claim 1, above, but it does not expressly teach the limitations of claims 25 or 26 or the limitation wherein the privilege group has multiple members.

Bray expressly teaches that multiple users may hold an edit privilege. See, Bray, claim 1, stating that multiple users may hold a privilege to edit a node. It is inherent that a privilege group comprised of multiple members with the same privilege contain multiple members. Note also, Bray, col. 1, lines 53-54, teaching that a user includes a computer process.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of NODAL with those of Bray.

The suggestion or motivation to combine the references is drawn from the fact that NODAL teaches a multi-user hierarchical document editing system from a less specific viewpoint, while Bray teaches the same system with emphasis on the locking

Art Unit: 2176

editing and locking functions. The references teach the same art with varying degrees of detail for specific functions.)

Regarding **dependent claim 28**, NODAL in view of Bray teaches:

The system of claim 26 wherein the member is an operator of an application program.

(Nodal teaches the limitations of claim 1, above, but it does not expressly teach the limitation of claims 25 or 26 or the limitation wherein the member is an operator of an application program.)

Bray expressly teaches that multiple users may hold an edit privilege. See, Bray, claim 1, stating that multiple users may hold a privilege to edit a node. It is inherent that a privilege group comprised of multiple members with the same privilege contain multiple members. Note also, Bray, col. 1, lines 53-54, teaching that a user includes a computer process. It is obvious that an operator of an application that is a member of a user group may be included in the user group for purposes of identification of the privilege holder in the document pedigree.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of NODAL with those of Bray.

The suggestion or motivation to combine the references is drawn from the fact that NODAL teaches a multi-user hierarchical document editing system from a less specific viewpoint, while Bray teaches the same system with emphasis on the locking

Art Unit: 2176

editing and locking functions. The references teach the same art with varying degrees of detail for specific functions.)

Regarding **dependent claim 29**, NODAL in view of Bray teaches:

The system of claim 26 wherein the member is a client computing device.

(Nodal teaches the limitations of claim 1, above, but it does not expressly teach the limitation of claims 25 or 26 or the limitation wherein the member is a client computing device.

Bray expressly teaches that multiple users may hold an edit privilege. See, Bray, claim 1, stating that multiple users may hold a privilege to edit a node. It is inherent that a privilege group comprised of multiple members with the same privilege contain multiple members. Note also, Bray, col. 1, lines 53-54, teaching that a user includes a computer process. It is obvious that a computer process may also include identification of the computing device as part of the identification of the source of the mutation request for purposes of the pedigree.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of NODAL with those of Bray.

The suggestion or motivation to combine the references is drawn from the fact that NODAL teaches a multi-user hierarchical document editing system from a less specific viewpoint, while Bray teaches the same system with emphasis on the locking editing and locking functions. The references teach the same art with varying degrees of detail for specific functions.)

Regarding **dependent claim 41**, NODAL in view of Bray teaches:

The method of claim 39 wherein a privilege is appropriate for the received access request when the mutation and privilege are both Read.

(Nodal teaches the limitations of claim 39, above, but it does not expressly teach the limitation wherein a privilege is appropriate when a mutation and privilege are both Read.

Bray expressly teaches that multiple users may hold a viewing privilege. See, Bray, col. 6, lines 42-49.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of NODAL with those of Bray.

The suggestion or motivation to combine the references is drawn from the fact that NODAL teaches a multi-user hierarchical document editing system from a less specific viewpoint, while Bray teaches the same system with emphasis on the locking editing and locking functions. The references teach the same art with varying degrees of detail for specific functions.)

Regarding **dependent claim 42**, NODAL in view of Bray teaches:

The method of claim 39 wherein a privilege is appropriate for the received access request when the mutation and privilege are both Insert.

Art Unit: 2176

(Nodal teaches the limitations of claim 39, above, but it does not expressly teach the limitation wherein a privilege is appropriate when a mutation and privilege are both Insert.

Bray expressly teaches that multiple users may hold a create privilege. See, Bray, col. 8, lines 3-59.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of NODAL with those of Bray.

The suggestion or motivation to combine the references is drawn from the fact that NODAL teaches a multi-user hierarchical document editing system from a less specific viewpoint, while Bray teaches the same system with emphasis on the locking editing and locking functions. The references teach the same art with varying degrees of detail for specific functions.)

Regarding **dependent claim 43**, NODAL in view of Bray teaches:

The method of claim 39 wherein a privilege is appropriate for the received access request when the mutation and privilege are both Update.

(Nodal teaches the limitations of claim 39, above, but it does not expressly teach the limitation wherein a privilege is appropriate when a mutation and privilege are both Update.

Bray expressly teaches that multiple users may hold an edit privilege. See, Bray, col. 6, line 52 through col. 7, line 67.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of NODAL with those of Bray.

The suggestion or motivation to combine the references is drawn from the fact that NODAL teaches a multi-user hierarchical document editing system from a less specific viewpoint, while Bray teaches the same system with emphasis on the locking editing and locking functions. The references teach the same art with varying degrees of detail for specific functions.)

Regarding **dependent claim 44**, NODAL in view of Bray teaches:

The method of claim 39 wherein a privilege is appropriate for the received access request when the mutation and privilege are both Delete.

(Nodal teaches the limitations of claim 39, above, but it does not expressly teach the limitation wherein a privilege is appropriate when a mutation and privilege are both Delete.

Bray expressly teaches that multiple users may hold a delete privilege. See, Bray, col. 8, line 63 through col. 9, line 64.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of NODAL with those of Bray.

The suggestion or motivation to combine the references is drawn from the fact that NODAL teaches a multi-user hierarchical document editing system from a less specific viewpoint, while Bray teaches the same system with emphasis on the locking

Art Unit: 2176

editing and locking functions. The references teach the same art with varying degrees of detail for specific functions.)

Regarding **claims 34-36, 40, 45, 47-48, and 50-62**, claims 34-36, 40, 45, 47-48, and 50-62 incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claims 3-5, 9, 13, 15-16, and 18-29, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

18. It is noted that any citations to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. See, MPEP 2123.

Response to Arguments

Applicants' arguments filed July 20, 2006 have been fully considered, but they are not persuasive.

Regarding objections to the drawings:

FIRST: Applicants argue that they are unable to find a requirement for lead lines in MPEP 608.02(q), as cited by the Examiner, arguing further that lead lines are "unnecessary if it clear from the drawing to which blocks or elements the reference characters correspond." See, Remarks , page 14, section II.(A).

The Examiner disagrees.

The Examiner is not aware of a rule where lead lines are unnecessary if it is clear from the drawing. However, MPEP 608.02(q) is clear, stating: "Lead lines are required for each reference character except for those which indicate the surface or cross section on which they are placed. Such a reference character must be underlined to make it clear that a lead line has not been left out by mistake."

SECOND: Applicants argue that they can find no prohibition against placing labels within shaded regions of a drawing in MPEP 608.02(p), as cited by the Examiner. See, Remarks, page 14, section II.(C).

The Examiner disagrees.

MPEP 608.2(p)(3), states: "Numbers, letters, and reference characters must measure at least .32 cm. (1/8 inch) in height. They should no be placed in the drawing so as to interfere with its comprehension. Therefore, they should no cross or mingle with the lines. They should not be placed upon hatched or shaded surfaces."

THIRD: Applicant claims to be unable to find a reference to MPEP 608(h), as cited by the Examiner. See, Remarks, page 15, section II.(E) It is noted that this was a typo, which should have been to MPEP 608.02(h). In that MPEP 608.02 was cited 14 times in the drawing rejections, including other citations to MPEP 608.02(h), the Examiner believes that the typo should have been obvious.

FOURTH: Applicants additional arguments regarding objections to the drawings have been considered and are not found to be persuasive. Accordingly the following objections are maintained:

Regarding all Figures, generally: Lead lines are generally missing. Lead lines are required for each reference character except for those that indicate the surface or cross section on which they are placed. See MPEP 608.02(q). Applicants are required to review all figures and make appropriate corrections in order to comply with 37 CFR 1.121(d) and MPEP 608.02(q).

Regarding Figures 3, 7B, 7C, 7D, 15, 16, 17, and 18: Reference numbers to the items therein are necessary to understand the figures. See, 35 U.S.C. 113.

Regarding Figure 1: Items 106, 108, and 112 contain labels within shaded regions. Numbers, letters, and reference characters should not be placed upon shaded surfaces. See, MPEP 608.02(p)(3).

Regarding Figure 3: Two items are labeled "302." The same reference character must never be used to designate different parts. See, MPEP 608.02(p)(5). It is suggested that if the parts are similar, applicants may identify the parts as "302A" and "302B," or adopt a similar distinctive identification scheme.

Regarding Figures 3 and 4: Parts of Figure 4 appear to be an expanded view of part of Figure 3, but the relationship between the Figures is not clear. It is

assumed that Applicants intended to further illustrate the relationships between items on Figure 3 in Figure 4, and based on that assumption, Applicants are directed to clearly show that relationship. See, MPEP 608.02(h) for guidance in showing exploded and partial views.

Further regarding Figures 3 and 4: It appears that items in Figure 3 also appear in Figure 4, but under different identification numbers. The same part of an invention appearing in more than one view of the drawing must always be designated by the same reference character. See, MPEP 608.02(p)(4). For example, the same items with multiple reference numbers include: 302 as 401; 304 as 407; 306 as 413; 310 as 410; and, many other multiple numbers. Applicants are required to review all Figures and make appropriate correction such that the identification numbers are uniform and consistent.

Regarding Figure 4: Items 418, 420, and 422 are not related to the rest of the figure. The disclosure identifies relationships for the items, but such relationships are not identified in the drawings. Specifically, item 418 is disclosed to relate to DDOM Client 407 through the DDOM protocol adapter and Message layer 412, but no such relationship is shown in the drawing. See, Specification, paragraph [0080]. Similarly, relationships are disclosed in paragraphs [0085] for items 420 and 422, but such relationships are not shown in the drawing. Appropriate correction is required.

Regarding Figure 7A: This Figure appears to be an exploded view of the "Server: MutateTree Routine" identified in Figure 10A, item 1014. Appropriate correction is required to properly identify the relationship of Figure 7A to Figure 10A and to make the reference numbers uniform and consistent. See, MPEP 608.02(h) and 608.02(p)(4).

Regarding Figure 8: This appears to be a full or partial exploded view of the "Broadcast" as disclosed in Figure 4, item 422. The relationship, if any, of this Figure must be clarified in relation to any other figures or items. See, MPEP 609.02(h).

Regarding Figure 9: The decision flow appears to be in error. Specifically, decision elements leading from items 904 and 906 do not make sense logically. In addition, it is unclear but appears from comparing Figure 9 to the disclosure, [00123], that the flow arrow from 908 to 916 should be to 908 instead. It also appears that the start should lead to block 906. Appropriate correction to accurately reflect the decision flow is required.

Regarding Figure 10A: It appears that items 1014 and 1016 are condensations of full or partial views disclosed in Figures 7A and 10B respectively. See, MPEP

608.02(h). Appropriate correction to accurately reflect the relationship between the views is required.

Regarding Figure 10B: As discussed above, it appears that Figure 10B is a full or partial exploded view of Figure 10A, item 1016. Appropriate correction to accurately reflect the relationship between the views is required.

Regarding Figure 14: Item 1413 does not appear in the disclosure. Reference characters not mentioned in the description shall not appear in the drawings. See, MPEP 608.02(p)(5). Appropriate correction is required.

Regarding Figures 16, 17, and 18: These drawings appear to present a flow of data or information, but it is unclear what is being shown and to where the various flow lines lead. See, 35 U.S.C. 113. As is noted above, reference numbers should assist in making the figures more clear. It is also suggested that Applicants consider using alternative flow chart diagrams to show illustrate the invention.

Regarding Figures 1, 5, 6, 9, and 11: Figures 1, 5, 6, 9, and 11 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g).

Regarding rejections of claims 1 and 32:

Applicants amended the claims to add the limitation "and determined based on another node of the hierarchical document," when receiving access privilege requests arguing that this additional limitation distinguishes over the prior art.

The Examiner disagrees.

Nodal teaches to check an additional node, specifically checking passwords. See, NODAL, page 17, last full paragraph. The password is in another node.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** for the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael K. Botts whose telephone number is 571-272-5533. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:00-4:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MKB/mkb


Heather R. Herndon
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2100